

Editorial

'Yankee go home'

President Bush has created a rising drumbeat of anti-American sentiment, and not only in Ibero-America. Socialists and conservatives alike have joined together in the European Parliament to condemn the U.S. invasion of Panama as a "flagrant violation of the sovereignty and integrity of an independent state." Nor did the Parliament overlook in its condemnation the obscene harassment of the papal nuncio and the Peruvian and Cuban embassies in Panama, but called them a violation of the Vienna Convention.

In Ibero-America, the United States is more unpopular than at any time since the reign of Teddy Roosevelt. Vice President Quayle has been forced to admit that his presence is not wanted in Ibero-America at this time. Speaking before the Hoover Institute about his proposed visit there to represent Bush administration policies, he reported that he had received advice from his friends in Venezuela that even there, a trip now would put the government in a less-than-comfortable situation. His planned trips to Venezuela and Mexico have been canceled for the immediate future.

One of the most disgusting aspects of present U.S. administration policy is its dishonesty with regard to its vaunted War on Drugs.

Despite the posturing by spokesmen for President Bush, on the need for Colombian President Barco to take an uncompromising position against the narco-traffickers at whatever cost, the drug-legalization lobby in the United States is making Barco's position increasingly difficult.

On Jan. 17, for example, former Assistant Secretary of State (under Shultz) Langhorne Motley urged consideration of the offer by the Extraditables. George Shultz himself, of course, has come out on the side of legalization. Motley's argument was reminiscent of the kind of justifications which the Bush administration has used for hostage negotiations in the Mideast. If the Extraditables will release the hostages they are holding and cease bombings then, he says, that constitutes a victory. In return for the promise by the narco-terrorists to stop trafficking in drugs, the United States should drop demands for their extradition to the United States

in order to stand trial.

This of course, is not an official administration position: To the contrary, the U.S. officially would have President Barco stand tough; however, the *Washington Times* newspaper on Oct. 20, reported that Washington was preparing "contingency plans" for negotiations with the traffickers. The relevant section of the article read:

"U.S. and Colombian officials acknowledge that Mr. Barco whose presidential term ends in August, [1990], is unlikely to resign from office with a clear outcome of his war on drugs. These officials also believe that most of Barco's probable successors are more likely to strike some sort of deal with the drug traffickers rather than continue to make the necessary sacrifices. Administration sources said they had yet to develop a contingency plan for such a case, given both Mr. Barco's and the U.S.'s refusal to entertain certain dealings with the traffickers.

"Some sources said the U.S. would accept Colombian proposals for plea bargaining in specific cases or partial amnesties if these furthered the goal of stopping the shipments of drugs to the U.S. . . . Said one source, 'The bottom line is: Does it serve Colombia's political needs and reduce the export of narcotics to the U.S.?' " When asked for comment, the first response of administration spokesmen, Marlin Fitzwater, was to plead ignorance, and refer the reporter to William Bennett's office.

One week later, Secretary of State Baker's response was to hedge. What he said, was: "That is not administration policy to the extent I am aware of."

In terms of *body language*, the United States is sending a clear signal that its War on Drugs is a thin pretext for imperial-style adventures, but not a serious policy to destroy the power of the narco-terrorists once and for all.

It is intolerable that the best that people are coming to hope for from the United States these days, is an end to the *big stick* policies of Teddy Roosevelt. What is needed is a total shift, to *morality* as the basis of policy, at home and abroad.